



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,270	10/28/2003	Thomas E. McConnell	PRINC-046C	4711

7590 05/18/2004

Kit M. Stetina, Esq.
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER
Suite 250
75 Enterprise
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

EXAMINER

PELHAM, JOSEPH MOORE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3742

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/695,270

Applicant(s)

MCCONNELL ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph M Pelham

Art Unit

3742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 40-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 40-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/19/03.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 40-50 and 53-57 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6639185. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims merely broaden the scope of the US'185 claims.

Claims 51 and 52 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6639185 in view of US Pat. 3947134 (US'134).

US'185 does not explicitly disclose anti-microbial agents. However, US'134 discloses anti-microbial agent usage in moist tissue dispenser. It would have been obvious to use such agents to avoid bacterial growth in the heated items.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 40, 42-44, 46-50, and 53-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. 4084080 (US'080).

US'080 discloses a housing comprising a body member 20 with an upper housing wall and having a peripheral wall which engages a base member 11, a metal water container 13, 15 in the housing, with apertures 17, and a heating element 31 adjacent the water container to heat the housing contents.

The Examiner notes that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention, such as "fabric" or "baby wipes," as recited in claims 55 and 56, must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). The towel warmer of US'080 is fully able to warm any type of towel or wipe, and hence meets the claim limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 41 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US'080 in view of US Pat. 6018145 (US'145).

The claims differ from US'080 only in calling for plastic construction, a pivoting lid, and the use of an anti-microbial agent. However, US'145 discloses, at Figs. 4 and 5, and col. 4, lines 37-50, plastic construction and a pivoting lid in a towel warmer. It would have been obvious to utilize plastic construction and a pivoting lid, after the manner of

US'145, to lower manufacturing cost, and provide more convenient access to the housing contents.

Claims 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US'080 in view of US Pat. 3947134 (US'134).

US'145 does not explicitly disclose anti-microbial agents. However, US'134 discloses anti-microbial agent usage in moist tissue dispenser. It would have been obvious to use such agents to avoid bacterial growth in the heated items.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/2/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that McMahan (US'080) fails to disclose a housing formed of base and body members configured to engage one another to form an "inside compartment." The Examiner notes that US'080 discloses identically, at Figs. 1 & 2, a base member 11 and body member 20 adapted to engage base member 11 so as to form an inside compartment. The water container 13, 15 is placed inside the compartment.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph M Pelham whose telephone number is 703-308-1709. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

5/17/04 
JOSEPH PELHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER